

REMARKS

Claims 1, 46, and 47 have been amended, while claims 36 and 38 are cancelled. Claims 1, 7-35, 37, and 39-47 therefore remain pending in the application. Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejections and, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, respectfully requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowance.

The amendments are supported by the specification and do not introduce new matter. Support in the written description for "a plurality of methods that enable the media engine to configure a media session for a presentation" can be found in claim 36 as originally filed. Support in the written description for "wherein a media session provides a simple API for building, configuring, and manipulating a pipeline of components for media flow control between an origin and one or more destinations" can be found on page 2, lines 10-13. Support in the written description for "wherein the partial topology is converted into a full topology" can be found in claim 38 as originally filed, and on page 10 lines 18-24.

§103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 7-14, 17-36, and 39-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Sullivan (see PTO-892 mailed 05 July 2007) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,047,554 B1 (Lortz). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 37 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Sullivan in view of Lortz and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,038,625 (Ogino). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Sullivan in view of Lortz and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,574,934 (Mirashrafi). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 46, and 47 for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections.

THE CLAIMS

Claim 1 recites a system comprising:

- one or more computer-readable media;
- an application program interface embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and which can be utilized to present a presentation;
- the application program interface comprising:
 - a plurality of open methods that can be called by an application, the open methods comprising a parameter for specifying a destination for the presentation, and at least a parameter for specifying a data source for the presentation; wherein collectively, the parameters for specifying a data source enable data sources to be specified in different manners, wherein said one parameter for specifying a data source specifies a partial topology object that defines sources, sinks, and transforms to be used in the presentation, wherein the partial topology is converted into a full topology;
 - a plurality of methods that enable the media engine to configure a media session for a presentation, wherein a media session provides a simple API for building, configuring, and manipulating a pipeline of components for media flow control between an origin and one or more destinations;
 - a method for ascertaining the state of a media engine that causes the presentation to be presented;
 - a method for ascertaining capabilities of the media engine;
 - a method to start processing media samples that are the subject of the presentation;
 - a method to stop processing media samples; and
 - a method to pause media sample processing.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office alleges that Sullivan in view of Lortz renders claim 1 obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection, Applicant has amended this claim to include elements from dependent claims 36 and 38. Applicant respectfully

submits that Sullivan in view of Lortz at least fails to teach or suggest “wherein said one parameter for specifying a data source specifies a *partial* topology object that defines sources, sinks, and transforms to be used in the presentation, *wherein the partial topology is converted into a full topology*; [and] a plurality of methods that enable the media engine to configure a *media session* for a presentation, wherein the media session provides a simple API for building, configuring, and manipulating a pipeline of components for media flow control between an origin and one or more destinations” (emphasis added) as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office cites “setTimeBase” as Applicant’s “a plurality of methods that enable the media engine to configure a media session for a presentation” (Office Action, page 9). Applicant respectfully disagrees, and instead submits that “SetTimeBase” appears to discuss setting a base time for a clock. A media session, however, as recited in claim 1 “provides a simple API for building, configuring, and manipulating a pipeline of components for media flow control”. For at least this reason, claim 1 is allowable.

The Office cites “Topology map” as Applicant’s “converting a partial topology into a full topology” (Office Action, page 9). Applicant respectfully disagrees, and instead submits that the “Topology map” discussed in Ogino is simply a map of an IEEE 1394 network topology, and thus does not discuss sources, sinks and transforms used in a presentation. A “Topology map” as discussed in Ogino merely defines physical connectedness of devices, while a topology object defines sources, sinks, and transforms that determine where media comes from, where it is outputted to, and what effects are applied to the media. In

addition, neither Ogino nor any other reference of record discusses converting a partial topology into a full topology as recited in Applicant's claim. For at least this reason, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-35, 37, and 39-45 depend from claim 1 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 1 apply equally to claims 2-35, 37, and 39-45. Claims 2-35, 37, and 39-45 are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach, or suggest. Applicant therefore submits that each of claims 2-35, 37, and 39-45 stands allowable at least for its dependency upon claim 1.

Claim 46 recites a system comprising:

- one or more computer-readable media;
- an application program interface embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and which can be utilized to present a presentation;
- the application program interface comprising:
 - a plurality of open methods that can be called by an application, the open methods comprising a parameter for specifying a destination for the presentation, and at least a parameter for specify a data source for the presentation; collectively, the parameters for specifying a data source enabling data sources to be specified in different manners, wherein said one parameter for specifying a data source specifies a partial topology object that defines sources, sinks, and transforms to be used in the presentation, wherein the partial topology is converted into a full topology;
 - a plurality of methods that enable the media engine to configure a media session for a presentation, wherein a media session provides a simple API for building, configuring, and manipulating a pipeline of components for media flow control between an origin and one or more destinations;

- a method for ascertaining the state of a media engine that causes the presentation to be presented;
- a method for ascertaining capabilities of the media engine;
- a plurality of methods for providing presentation control;
- a method that provides access to metadata associated with the presentation;
- a method that provides access to statistics associated with the presentation;
- an event generator interface for generating events associated with the presentation;
- a stream selector interface that provides methods for setting stream selection modes; and
- a media session interface that provides methods that enable the media engine to configure a media session for a presentation.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office alleges Claim 46 corresponds to claims 1, 20-22, 34 and 36 and therefore is rejected under the same rationale. Claim 46 is allowable for similar reasons as set forth above with regard to claim 1. For example, Sullivan in view of Lortz at least fails to disclose or suggest “wherein said one parameter for specifying a data source specifies a partial topology object that defines sources, sinks, and transforms to be used in the presentation, wherein the partial topology is converted into a full topology”, as recited in independent Claim 46.

For at least this reason, claim 46 is allowable.

Claim 47 recites a system comprising:

- one or more computer-readable media;

- an application program interface embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and which can be utilized to present a presentation;
- the application program interface comprising:
- an *open* method that can be called by an application, the open method comprising a parameter for specifying a partial topology object that defines sources, sinks, and transforms to be used in the presentation, wherein the partial topology is converted into a full topology.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office alleges Claim 47 corresponds to claim 1 and therefore is rejected under the same rationale. Claim 47 as amended is allowable for similar reasons as set forth above with regard to claim 1. For example, Sullivan in view of Lortz at least fails to disclose or suggest “the open method comprising a parameter for specifying a partial topology object that defines sources, sinks, and transforms to be used in the presentation, wherein the partial topology is converted into a full topology”, as recited in independent Claim 47.

For at least this reason, claim 47 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 7-35, 37, and 39-47 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to contact the undersigned representative to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/David W. Foster/

Dated: 4/28/2008

David W. Foster (daved@leehayes.com)
Reg. No. 60,902
Christopher Lattin (christopher@leehayes.com)
Registration No. 56,064

Customer No. 22801

Telephone: (509) 324-9256
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com